

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS AUSTIN

GERALD C. MANN ATTORNEY SENERAL

Hon. George H. Shepperd Comptroller of Public Accounts Austin, Texas

Dear Sir:

Gpinion No. 0-1741A/
Re: Mesessity of exemption certificate
for persons who will be twenty-one
years old after January 31st of the
year in which they desire to vote.

This will acknowledge receipt of your letter, requesting a reconsideration of our Opinion No. 0-1741. Your letter reads as follows:

"Please refer to your opinion No. 1741, dated December 7; 1939, addressed to Honorable Ross E. Burke, Sr., County Attorney of Celiad County, and clarify for this department the following points. The last two paragraphs of the opinion road as follows:

opinion No. 2008, supra, correctly construes the law relating to the question submitted in your inquiry and related questions, and for your convenience we enclose a copy of this opinion.

"Th view of the foregoing authorities, you are respectfully advised that it is the opinion of this
department that all persons who do
not reside in a city of ten thousand
inhabitants or more and who became
twenty-one years of age after January
31, 1940, may vote in any election
held in this State provided they comply with the terms of Article 2968a,
with reference to obtaining exemption
certificate on or before the 31st day

of January in the year in which he desires to vote, regardless of the time when such individual may become twenty-one years of age, the only requisite being that said person must be twenty-one at the time he presents himself at the polls to vote, and not otherwise disqualified to vote under the Constitution and the laws of this State.

"Since the first paragraph we have quoted states that you believed that Conference Opinion No. 2988, supra, correctly construed the law, and the last paragraph of that opinion states that it was not necessary to issue exemption certificates to persons who became twenty-one years of age in April, 1936 that resided in a city which had a population of two thousand inhabitants in order to entitle them to vote in the July primary 1936, it raises a question as to the specific meaning of the last paragraph in your opinion dated December 7, 1939.

"It was held in Conference Opinion No. 2988 that Article 2969 has not been repealed. You will notice that this article specially provides that it will not be necessary for a person who became twenty-one years of age after the first day of January, and before the date of the following election to obtain a certificate, unless he resides in a city that has a population of five thousand or more inhabitants. Pages 8, 9 and 10 of Opinion No. 2968 make special reference to the provisions of Article 2969.

"Following the passage of Article 2968A, the Tax Assessor-collectors were advised that it would be necessary to issue an exemption certificate to a person if he became twenty-one years of age after January 1st of the year for which the certificate was issued, and before February 1 of the following year, and that it would not be necessary to issue the certificate if the person became twenty-one years of age after January 31 following the year

for which a poll tax is assessed.

"Since the court in the Goliad County case referred to in your opinion apparently held that certificates should be issued in all instances, and there is some question as to the requirements of Article 2068A, you will please advise us as soon as possible whether or not it will be necessary for the Tax Assessor-collectors to issue certificates to all persons who have become twenty-one years of age since January 1, 1939, or who will become twenty-one years of age prior to the date of an election at which the persons might desire to vote.

"If Article 2969 has not been repealed, will it be necessary for a person to obtain a certificate if his twenty-first birthday is after January 31, 1940, and he resides in a city having a population of five thousand or more inhabitants, or will the exemption apply to all persons who do not reside in a city having a population of ten thousand or more inhabitants? You will notice that Article 2968 at one time applied to cities of five thousand or more inhabitants. When this article was repealed so as to apply to cities of ten thousand inhabitants, Article 2969 was not repealed."

Article 2968a, Vernon's Civil Annatated Statutes reads in part as follows:

"Every person not subject to the disqualifications set out in Article 2954 of the Revised Civil Statutes of 1925 who does not reside in a city of ten thousand inhabitants or
more, and who is exempt from the payment of a
poll tax by reason of the fact that he or she
has not yet reached the age of twenty-one years
on the first day of January preceding its levy,
or who is exempt from the payment of a poll
tax because he or she was not a resident of the
State on the first day of January preceding its
levy, but who shall have since become eligible
to vote by reason of length of residence or age,

shall, on or before the thirty-first day of January of the year in which he or she offers to vote, obtain from the Assessor and Collector of Taxes for the county of his or her residence a certificate of exemption from the payment of a poll tax, and no such person who has failed or refused to obtain such certificate of exemption from the payment of a poll tax shall be allowed to vote.

"Such exempt person shall on cath state
his name, age, race, county of residence, occupation, the length of time, he has resided in
the State of Texas, the length of time he has
resided in said county, and the length of time
in the city, and the number of the ward or
voting precinct in which he resides, and shall
also state his street address by name and number,
if numbered, and his or her rural address if
not a resident of a city or a village. He shall
also state the grounds upon which he claims
exemption from the payment of a poll tax, and
such information pertaining to foreign-born
citizens as is set out in the certificate hereinafter prescribed.

ment of poll tax shall be issued from a well bound book, containing therein original and duplicate, and upon issue the certificates issued to the exempt voter shall be detached from said book, leaving therein a duplicate carbon or other copy thereof, which shall contain the same description, and the original certificate, bearing its proper number, shall be delivered to the citizen in person to identify him in voting. Certificates of exemption for each precinct shall be numbered consecutively, beginning at Number One.

"The Tax Assessor and Collector shall place the names of such persons who are exempt from the payment of poll tax and who receive an exemption certificate under the terms of this Act, on the regular list of qualified voters for each precinct.

"No charge shall be made by the Tax Assessor

and Collector for the issuance of certificates of exemption as prescribed by this Act.

......

"In the event the exempt voter, holding certificate under this Article, shall remove from one voting precinct to another within the county, he shall only be required to present his certificate of exemption to the Tax Assessor and Collector for endorsement, which endorsement shall show the date of removal, and the date of endorsement, the new address and precinct to which such voter has removed, which endorsement shall be under seal and signed by the County Tax Assessor and Collector.

"In the event the exempted voter holding certificate under this article shall remove from the county in which he resided when same was issued, to another county in this State, he shall be required to present his certificate of exemption to the Assessor and Collector of taxes of the county of his new residence for reissue of registration and endorsement at least twenty days before any election at which he expects to vote.

"In the event of the loss of certificate of exemption, the voter may secure a reissue under his old number by making affidavit of such loss before the County Tax Assessor and Collector."

We quote from the case of Clark vs. Stubbs, 131 SW 2nd 663, as follows:

"Appellee challenged the votes of Nell Nose Morrisey, Jeff Dyer, Lillie Gibson, Widbur Herwig, Louise Widerbrush, Mrs. Bowman Baxiel, Clinton Jacobs, and Willis Blackburn, because each of them became 21 years of age after January, 1938, and prior to Movember 8, 1838, and under the governing statute, therefore, they were not entitled to vote without an exemption certificate. Art. 2968a, Vernon's

Ann. Civ. St., Acts of 1935, 44th Lag. P. 686, Chap. 292, Sec. 1, provides that each of the voters in question was required to obtain an exemption certificate before he or she would be satitled to vote. Neither of them obtained such a certificate. The statute is mandatory and these votors were not qualified to vote at the election, and the trial court correctly excluded all of such votes. Appellant contends, however, that since the caption to Art. 2968a did not specifically define the voters to whom the exemption clause related or referred, that it was unconstitutional. This is an election contest. It is not a civil suit, and the constitutionality of the statute cannot be attacked in this sort of proceeding. This court held in Trimmier v. Carlton, 264, 3. 7. 253, 255, that 'jurisdiction in election contests is limited to such matters as tend to show that the election twas not properly ordered or failly conducted, such as the failure to give notice of the time and place where the election is to be held or that illegal votes were cast thereat. or some other matter that would impeash the fairness of the result. Bassel v. Shanklin (Tox. Civ. App.), 183 3. W. 105; McGell vs. Lewis (Tex. Civ. App.), 265 S. N. 325.*

In the case of Rogers v. Smith, at al, 119'3. V. (2d) 678, the Beaumont Court of Civil Appeals held that, in an election contest, the refusal on the part of the district court hearing same to count a vote by a party who became 31 years of age before an election held on april'5, 1987, and subsequent to January 1, 1937, was not error, where such voter failed to obtain from the tax assessor and collector a Certificate of Exemption, and that such person was not a qualified voter. As authority for this holding, the court cited Article 1968s, Vernon's Annotated Civil Statutes, Acts 1935, 44th Leg., p. 686, ch. 292, Section 1.

The above quoted paragraph of our Opinion No. 1741, wherein we stated,

"We believe that Conference Opinion No. 2988, supra, correctly construes the law relating to the

question submitted in your inquiry and related questions, and for your convenience we enclose a copy of this opinion."

is restricted to the question submitted in the above mentioned opinion. However, it was not intended to hold that persons who became 21 years of age after January 1, 1940, and who reside in a city which had a population of less than 10,000 in-habitants were not required to obtain an exemption certificate on or before January 51, 1940, as provided for by Article 2968a, supra, to entitle them to vote in any election held in 1940 and at a time after they became 21 years of age.

In our original Opinion No. 0-1741, we said "Article 2969 is not repealed by implication by Article 2968a." This was a quotation from Conference Opinion No. 2988, dated May 26, 1935, and was in effect overruled by our Opinion No. 0-414 dated March 17, 1939. Regardless of what may have been said in Conference Opinion No. 2988 or in our recent Opinion No. 0-1741, the cases of Clark v. Stubbs and Rogers v. Smith, supra, specifically hold that those persons exempt from the payment of the poll tax by reason of non-age and residing in a city of less than 10,000 inhabitants must obtain exemption certificates on or before the Slat day of January of the year in which they offer to vote. Application of the statute, Article 2968a, is made clear by the opinions of the court in these cases.

We believe what we have above said answers your first question and makes it unnecessary to answer your second question.

This opinion is limited to a construction of Article 2968a and does not in any way attempt to construe Article 2965, which applies only to residents of cities of 10,000 inhabitants or more.

Trusting that we have satisfactorily clarified our original Opinion No. 0-1741, we are

Yours very truly

ATTORNET CENERAL OF TEXAS By Adell William

APPROVEDJUN 29, 1940

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

Ardell Williams

Assistant APPROVED OPINION COMMITTEE

do: WA

Thir Opinion Modifies Opinion # 0-1741